UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Broaden,

Europe,

or Die!

By ROMAIN ROLLAND

VOLUME CVII NUMBER 8

Chicago, April 20, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 115
Our Futile Community Religious Leadership—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 117
Jottings.—J. H. H. 120

ARTICLES—
A Free American Looks at India—III—Democracy and Caste—EDWARD HOLTON JAMES 120
Broaden, Europe, or Die!—ROMAIN ROLLAND 122
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XXIII 125

POETRY—
India—*Grace Kemmerling Wellington* 115
Beyond Compromise—ROBERT WHITAKER 121
Credo—MARGA CALLICOTTE 121
Democracy—BERNICE IRELAND POWELS 124
The Tenement—SEYMOUR G. LINK 126

CORRESPONDENCE—
The Gandhi-Irwin Truce: Comment—RICHARD B. GREGG 127
The Present Situation in India—J. VIJAYA-TUNGA 127
Masters' Lincoln—BERTHA JOHNSTON 127

THE FIELD—
A Governor Vetoes a Capital Punishment Bill—HARRY H. WOODRING 114
Second International Congress of the Theosophical Order of Service 128

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Governor Vetoes a Capital Punishment Bill

I herewith return House Bills No. 14, 20, and 23 without my signature, said bills restoring the death penalty in the state of Kansas.

I have hesitated to exercise my veto power upon bills which were approved by more than two-thirds of the members of the legislature. However, the constitution delegates to me the authority and places upon me the duty of exercising my independent judgment and acting upon legislation with a view to the best interests of the state. I would be derelict in my duty and could find no excuse to my own conscience if I failed to veto legislation which I consider unsound.

I note that the establishment of an electric chair is authorized, but no appropriation is made to pay the cost of the equipment. The bills could not therefore be operative and for this reason should be vetoed as ineffective. However, I do not wish to base my veto upon this defect.

When these bills were first introduced I stated that I would sign them if they were passed by a large majority in both the house and senate. I made the statement for the reason that I supposed a large majority in the legislature would be indicative of an overwhelming public sentiment in favor of the bills. I had made no special study of the subject, my opposition to the death penalty was based upon no strong conviction, and I felt the need of some change in our laws which would be conducive to better law observance. Since I have realized that to me would eventually fall the responsibility of approving or rejecting the return of capital punishment to this state I have given the matter serious thought, and some study. I have tried to familiarize myself with the observations and research of those trained men who have made a life study of the subject of penology. The result has been the gradual arrival at a firm conviction that the proposed legislation is unsound in theory, that it has been demonstrated to be bad in practice, and that its adoption would be most unwise from every viewpoint. I have also been convinced that public opinion is overwhelmingly against the bills.

My veto of these bills is not actuated by any maudlin sympathy for the criminal. Society has the right and must protect itself against the assaults of the anti-social. My veto is predicated upon my conviction that it is for the best interests of the state that capital punishment be not restored, and it is with the interests of society in mind that I exercise the veto power.

While the science of criminology, which embraces the science of penology, is a subject upon which we all have definite, pronounced and generally erroneous views, the truth is that most of the defects in our system of dealing with crime are due to our failure to put away passion and prejudice and attack the solution of the problem

(*Continued on page* 128)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVII MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1931 NUMBER 8

INDIA

I roll on—
nothing can stop me . . .
I am the wind,
the surge of the sea,
the tears, the sighs and
the moans of the people—
I am the blow, unstruck—
the cry withheld . . . .
I am all these things,
As I roll on . . . .

Nothing shall stop me—
I seep under doors . . . .
creep in every crack . . . .
fill the air with my
silent clamor—
I am a thousand years
of waiting—
ten thousand years of pain,
rolling on . . . . on . . . .

Only the sky
knows my stature,
O puny hand, raised against me! . . . .
Bullets and bayonets and
poisoned gas but feed me—
for I am the dream and the
dawn of the stricken,
rolling on . . . .

I am the
muttered curse hurled on high—
the red wish of the
living dead . . . . accumulated despair
and crushed hope—
Lightning dwells within me,
and a white fire—
rolling deep . . . .

I am the
dreadful patience of all
the piled up years—
the color of the soil,
and its voice . . . .
I am . . . . Revolt—
that power and glory
forever
rolling on . . . . on . . . . ON!

Grace Kemmerling Wellington, in
The Road to Freedom

It would seem to be the irony of fate that religion should be at the bottom of the most dire difficulty now confronting the people of India. Of course, this is no new thing in the world's history. Religion, which should unite men in one universal bond of brotherhood, as a matter of fact has in all times and places been an occasion of furious division. India is no exception to the rule. Here there is the usual variety of faiths. But the fiercest feud rages between Hinduism and Mohammedanism. In nearly every item of belief and practise these two religions are opposed to one another. Peace at the bottom is almost impossible between ignorant and fanatical devotees. At the top antagonism runs over into momentous political and social questions of franchise, minority rights, and what not. The whole situation is pitiable, with the destiny of India from first to last at stake. The English naturally take the position that this is a problem which Indians themselves must settle. Gandhi agrees in his contention that Hindu-Moslem unity is a necessary condition of *Swaraj*. It is for this reason that, with policy toward Britain temporarily settled, the Mahatma is turning all his energies to the settlement of this religious war. Here must come another "truce," as a preparation for final and enduring peace. Gandhi has grappled with this problem before, and has more than once obtained amazing results. If any man can solve the difficulty, this saint of all his people is the one. But it must be conceded that the obstacles in his way are enormous, and that success would mark a greater triumph than any thus far recorded in his career. The blessings of the world will accompany him in this latest prodigious task.

France is now proposing a customs union of all Europe outside of Germany and Austria and in isolation of these two central countries which have recently completed the sensational customs pact as between themselves. The French proposal is obviously unfriendly, and about the speediest way of hastening the "next war" that we can imagine. What caused the last war if not the division of Europe into an alliance on the one hand and an *entente* upon the other, each group representative of competing economic as well as political interests? And now France, moved by pique, jealousy and fear, proposes to repeat this experience of dividing the people of Europe against themselves! Of course, there is one great difference in the situation today as compared with yesterday, and that is that, in any attempt to isolate the central countries, Russia will be on the side of Germany and Austria, not of France. But this fact is relatively unimportant. What bulks large and terrible is this serious proposal to organize competitive economic systems on the European continent. That Briand will give his support to this idea we

cannot believe. Nothing could be more fatal at once to the letter and spirit of his dream of a United States of Europe. As Briand is powerful, this may effectively kill the scheme at the start. Meanwhile, France remains at this hour what she has been ever since the close of the Great War—the most dangerous menace to peace in our western world. Until "la Republique" is curbed, there can be no permanent assurance of international harmony and cooperation.

We wish we understood some things better than we do. This matter of international finance, for example! More particularly this huge loan of $60,000,000, recently announced, from the House of Morgan in New York to the House of Hapsburg in Madrid! Why should J. Pierpont be sending money to Alfonso at just this time? The world being what it is, we should say that it was to help the King to maintain his throne, and thus to defeat the revolutionary attempt to get rid of monarchy and establish democracy in one of the few tyrant-ridden countries still left on the surface of the globe. But why should Morgan want to bolster up monarchy and delay the progress of democracy? What kind of business is this for the son of the forefathers who got rid of George III a century and a half ago. to be engaged in? It was America that set the pace for democracy in the eighteenth century. Is it America that is going to retard and block and hinder democracy in the twentieth century? And look what trouble this sort of thing lays up for the future! Some day before long the democratic forces are going to be successful in Spain as they were in Russia, and Alfonso will go the way of Nicholas. Then, when the new government is organized, it will find itself saddled with debts contracted by the late monarchy. Will it pay, or even acknowledge, these debts which were used as chains to imprison and bind its heroic champions? Why should the new democracy bow to a wretched slavery of this sort? Yet if it denies these debts, the world will ring with denunciations of repudiation and dishonor, and outlaw the new Spain with the new Russia. Frankly, we do not like these financial transactions. We think that banks should have as little to do with states as churches. All the talk about international finance being the friend of peace and progress will remain as so much "bunk" in our mind so long as this sort of thing goes on.

When Mme. Schwimmer and Professor MacIntosh and others were denied citizenship in our courts because of their pacifist views in regard to war service, we became properly denunciatory in these columns. Now that a court has granted citizenship to an applicant in the face of his unwillingness to bear arms in defense of the country, we feel it proper that we should be loudly vocal in praise and gratitude. The applicant in this case was a Norwegian, a student in the Divinity School of Boston University, who declared himself a thorough-going conscientious objector. The story, as printed in the Boston *Herald,* runs as follows:

> In the presence of the court and a large number of spectators, made up of other applicants for citizenship, he was asked by Maxwell Lamb, naturalization examiner:
> "In the event of war would you bear arms in defense of the United States?"
> "I would not," Brobold declared.
> Judge Lowell interrupted the interrogation, and asked:
> "If the United States became involved in a war with a foreign power which God forbid, would you fight for the foreign nation?"
> "I would not."
> "What would you do?"
> "I would assist the United States government in every way in my power other than bearing arms."
> "Admitted," said the court.

Our D. A. R. friends are going to be excited about this. It is already threatened by one hundred per cent patriots that the case will be taken on appeal to the Supreme Court. We hope it will, for this means an excellent chance to get a clear and decisive and favorable ruling on a matter now unhappily confused. But meanwhile it is cheering to discover that there is a judge who knows what liberty means and still preserves upon the bench some of the traditions of the day when America was great and unafraid. All honor to Judge Lowell! A few more magistrates of this brand of intelligence and spirit, and our country will take on once again the aspect of a land which has known the strength and glory of true democracy.

It amuses us to hear protests against Prohibition on the score of its violation of personal liberty, of the sanctity of the home, and what not, when we see what the government is permitted to do in other directions without protest of any kind. Take this drive by the Income Tax Bureau against gangsters and racketeers! Let it be said at once that we have no sympathy with these lawless gentry. With the power of the law breaking down everywhere else, we are frankly glad that in the income tax the government seems to have a weapon which it can use effectively against brigands. But look at what this means in its farthest implication! Here is the government deliberately undertaking to look into the details of a man's income, the most intimate of all personal affairs. It is asking banks to cooperate, so that private bank accounts may be revealed for official examination. It is asking the public to help *by reporting anybody who may seem to be living beyond his known sources of income, so that the government may immediately investigate and find out where the person in question gets his money.* What do we think of "snooping" of this kind? How much personal liberty is there left when the governmental authorities can check up on us in this fashion? As a matter of fact, the whole income tax procedure constitutes an infringement of the old Jeffersonian ideal of democracy beside which Prohibition fades away into utter insignificance. Yet nobody objects or complains. On the contrary, the income tax is almost universally accepted as

one of the fairest and most effective methods of taxation known to government. But when Washington undertakes, not to invade our homes, or open our bank accounts, or watch our personal expenditures, but simply to interfere with a pernicious traffic in liquor, comparable in every way to the traffic in drugs and women, we get enormously excited because we can't get drinks as easily or safely as before. O, consistency, thou art a jewel!

The furore over the late Knute Rockne has ended. It was undoubtedly the greatest sentimental outbreak of public feeling, as whipped up and directed by our newspapers, since the passing of Valentino. In Rockne's case there were at least two legitimate excuses for what took place. His death was sudden and tragic beyond words to describe. Furthermore, the man himself was beloved of all who knew him, and was mourned for qualities of rare and exemplary virtue. But when this has been said, all has been said. And what is there in this to call for messages from presidents and kings, newspaper hysteria of the most maudlin type, and praise as though the greatest of the great had gone? We find ourself in whole-hearted agreement with that wise as well as witty man, Heywood Broun.

I would not have public sympathy and respect less ready and articulate than it now is, (said Mr. Broun). But I must say frankly that it is a curious world in which the teaching of a game looms up larger in the popular imagination than instruction in the principles of life itself. I wonder what will be left to mark the passing of any one who has profoundly affected the educational system of our country.

Knute Rockne's power of leadership was extraordinary; his manhood was of highest quality. But after all, if we be sane, should we not recognize that both were operative in a comparatively narrow and essentially unimportant field of human endeavor? This football coach, fine as he was, touched life at no vital point. He was in no sense a great figure in the nation. That he should have been raised to such fame, and mourned with such lavish laudation, is a sign only of the pleasure-madness of the American people at this hour. We are simply crazy over the trivialities of sport and entertainment, both of which interests, incidentally, have been completely commercialized. Should we be proud, or ashamed, of such a spectacle?

Our Futile Community Religious Leadership

Each new contact with American communities impresses one anew with our present religious futility. One of the most striking illustrations of this is that of a community in which there occurred recently one of the most fiendish lynchings in all of our unsavory history. When we visited the town a short time ago we felt a sense of futility in the very atmosphere. By no process of reasoning can such savagery as dominates a lynching mob be made to harmonize with sound religion. Yet here was public sentiment sufficiently strong and widespread to make the lynchers feel that they had community support.

An official church investigation of the affair states that while the leadership was furnished by people from a wide area, there is good evidence that at least one-third of those participating were residents of the community. It is further added that if those who were guilty of the deed "had not been sure of popular support, it probably would not have occurred. They expected and received widespread approval."

Those in the community who justified the affair, and were at the same time more or less closely identified with the churches, doubtless reasoned that the crime for which the lynching was believed to be an expiation was peculiarly fiendish, that it was perpetrated by a monster who had previously offended flagrantly against society and that our broken-down legal system had played a notoriously farcical role in handling his case. All of which was true to the facts.

Without attempting to pass upon any of these ethical refinements, I wish only to point out in this connection that these very details only emphasize the sense of futility which seems to most characterize the whole situation.

The official church report already referred to points out that the event was definitely anticipated by all intelligent citizens. The local churches consisted of five white Protestant, one Negro Protestant and two Catholic. If their members and leaders practiced ordinary intelligence they were as fully informed of the impending event as were other citizens. Yet nothing was done by religious or other community leadership to forestall the savage issue.

The official church report goes on to state that after the event the ineptitude of the churches was more glaring still.

Only one minister made mention of the affair in the pulpit; the other four ministers (of the five white Protestant churches) agreed to keep silent.

On account of a request by the Negro minister, one of the ministers stated that he was asked to say that Negro citizens wanted peace and goodwill.

Perhaps some other time I may speak upon this, but I think that now we need to quiet our minds and turn our thoughts to making our lives the best we can and doing what God wants us to do.

This minister preached on Christians giving evidence of the grace of God in their daily living, and illustrated it by the story of the conversion of a drunkard.

Another minister preached on the "Eleventh Commandment" and said among other things that

. . . there are men and women today who claim to be Christians but refuse to give one penny to help spread the missionary tidings and make Christians. We need more of the kind of

love that will help in work across the seas to bring Christ to those who do not know.

Another preached on "persecutions," using as illustrations the persecutions of Paul and of Jesus who "opposed the gamblers in the Temple." On the Sunday following the lynching a petition to close a pool hall in town was presented in some of the churches.

Before the reader joins in condemnation of this procedure on the part of the churches, let him outline some concrete alternative. Let him face the situation as it actually existed in that community on that day. Suppose one of the ministers had arisen in his pulpit on the Sunday following the lynching, had described vividly the savage onslaught upon the fiend, had depicted the sacrifice of all that makes for a sane and wholesome civilization in the riot of blood and of fire, and had concluded with a scathing denunciation of all who claim the rights and prerogatives of civilization and at the same time participated either by thought or deed in the ghastly affair. Would that course have saved the situation? Would it have vindicated religion in the community? It may be remarked incidentally that such a minister would have been run out of town the following day if he had actually survived the Sunday night following his homiletic effort. But that may be properly esteemed a mere incident. His going would have been for his own health and would certainly have been esteemed to be for the good of the community. The pall of futility would not have been lifted by his performance.

Or, suppose one of the ministers had ascended his pulpit plaintively to describe the suffering of the fiendish criminal in the hands of the mob, that after dwelling upon its details he had drawn in parallel a picture of the conditions which should prevail under the spell of a religion of gentleness and long-suffering and submission to injustice and turning of the other cheek to the smiter. Would that performance have improved the situation? Would that have vindicated the cause of true religion in a community where it had been so malignantly sacrificed?

It is quite impossible to lift this pall of futility by any hectoring of the religious leadership installed in the existing churches of that particular community. Remember those churches' background, their history of futile divisions and evasions. The fact is their leadership ran true to form. Ministers trained as they had been trained, in charge of churches like those churches, could not be expected to proceed in a manner essentially different from the course actually followed by these leaders. Therein lies our despair. The futility here depicted prevails generally among our American communities, though not elsewhere, of course, in such ghastly features.

For months the whole land has lain under a deadening financial and industrial depression. How largely our futile spiritual leadership is chargeable with these conditions nobody is prepared to estimate. We stood on a street corner the other day in company with a citizen prominent in the professional and political life of his community. It was a typical middle-west county seat town. The inevitable court house stood in the center of the public square. Around the four sides were the hitching racks now transformed into parking space for innumerable automobiles. On the sidewalks that afternoon there stood scores, in the hotel, hundreds, of able-bodied men for the most part dressed in conventional farmer and working-man's blue denim. A few indifferently conversed with one another. Others mustered the ambition to suck a straw. For the rest, they simply stood, leaning up against their unstarched woolen shirts. We had asked previously if the depression was likely to give rise throughout the middle west to radical political movements and were assured by those who seemed competent to estimate that it would not. There was no symptom of radicalism in this idling group. We doubt if a communist orator could have enticed a dozen of them across the street to listen to his harangue.

We laid before the citizen with whom we were conversing this hypothesis.

Suppose a group of responsible citizens had catalogued in advanced the man-power of the community, had listed the men and women of productive years and had classified them according to their various skills? Suppose then a little social insight and engineering skill had been brought to bear in planning a profitable community enterprise which could be so dated and developed as to utilize this available human energy? Suppose, in the third place, the local bankers and financiers, in whose hands funds had embarrassingly accumulated, and whose frozen assets constituted one of the most serious features of the economic situation, had been enlisted to cooperate in carrying out the agreed-upon engineering projects?

His reply was,

Yes, we could have done that, and if we had we would not have been sitting around for all these long months waiting for the Federal and State governments to do something for us.

Even to hint that inspiration and leadership in such a common-sense procedure might be conceived as a religious responsibility would set the ministers and church people of that community agog. They have not the intellectual and spiritual capacity to conceive religion in such terms. Yet, all that they have been doing during this period has been, in the light of the actual economic conditions in the community, a puttering and pitiful futility. On the other hand, a wisely inspired and directed community could have lifted itself out of both its economic and spiritual slump under the impulses of common-sense facing of the realities.

Of course, it is fair to ask whether the religious leaders in our typical American community are competent for the leadership proposed. The answer is an emphatic "No." None has received adequate training. None has been given the first conception of his duties which would arouse in him a sense of responsibility for such tasks.

If it be asked whether the community would respond to leadership in the field suggested under the aegis of religion the prompt reply must again be "No."

The blind have led for so long that followers are uniformly blind. It would be almost a miracle if any community should pool its present financial resources, eked out in pitiful ministerial salaries, to employ a different type of leader, capable of doing what is manifestly needful for the economic and spiritual regeneration of the community. It would be a revolution, indeed, if a religious leader were asked, first of all, to record a vow in the presence of God and all the citizen witnesses that under no conditions would he ever preach a sermon nor conduct a Bible class nor occupy his time with numerous other futilities which now absorb the feeble energies of the present religious leadership. Yet, such a resort would be logical from the point of view of both religion and social efficiency. For, none of the ministers in charge of the churches in our smaller communities are capable of real preaching or ever will be capable though they press on in their present futile program for a thousand years. Nor, do any of them employ their Biblical instructions in a manner really to inspire and direct an efficient religious response in the community.

Once in a long while a young fellow appears in one of these communities who, being inexperienced enough to be relatively unhampered by ecclesiastical precedent, actually discovers a degree of initiative in community leadership. He is such an anomaly that nobody expects him to last. There is universal agreement that he is too big for his job. He himself speedily reaches that conclusion. Neither he nor anybody else conceives the possibility of his making his community grow with his growth. He is accordingly soon enticed away to a church in a minor or major city. There he inevitably becomes ecclesiastically conventionalized and his budding social initiative is nipped ere it can flower. The mechanism of one of these larger churches is sufficient to keep him absorbed. It has no more community sense or influence, relatively to the demands of its community, than does the town or country church, but it is larger in and of itself and beguiles ministerial ambition by a delusion of religious activity.

Only the other day I was speaking with a young professional woman whose short memory carries her back to a prosperous rural community to which came one of these aggressive young ministers. He created an epoch in the life of the town. He lifted the church and its program to a level which only he by permanent residence could enable the community to maintain. He and the community followed the usual course. He was speedily enticed to another charge. He is now an ambitious church builder in a minor city. The massive plant he erected is of the usual Gothic type, rambling over a valuable city site. The program of the institution is brilliant. Like most such institutions it is largely self-contained. There is no real community leadership. The minister is already restive and wondering why the scouts of some metropolitan church do not find him out.

In the meantime the church and the rural community in which he began his ministry have slumped. Latterly, the church is unable even to maintain the conventional hack service of a part-time itinerant. Surrounded by magnificent economic and social resources, the community has sunk into that sodden spiritual indifference which distinguishes multitudes of typical American communities.

While this spiritual devastation prevails on every side the opportunities for inspired religious leadership in American communities are thrilling beyond expression. They can, however, contribute no thrill to men given only the religious insights and trained in the religious technique of our theological schools. The worst thing that could happen to a young man headed for real community religious leadership would be to attend one of these institutions. For the purposes desiderated conservative and liberal are alike hopeless. If a few communities might under some intelligent guidance be inspired to seek out and support leaders of an entirely different type and set them upon the discharge of functions remote from those which now occupy our dead-and-alive churches, the demonstration of what can be done in the way of religious regeneration would soon be convincing to the whole country. These leaders must be trained, of course, but their training should lead them, first, to face realities, and second, to discover a divine ingenuity and flexibility in making the most of the realities in the particular community to which they go. An enlightened university training in the elements of sociology, of economics and of social organization would be indispensable, but any attempt at a standardized technique would be death of such leadership. No two communities are alike. The stage of development of no two would permit application of an identical technique. Senseless divisions of the population into sects on the one part, and, on the other, stereotyped ecclesiastical method now doubly insure failure. How long, Oh Lord? When will even a few enlightened leaders appear ready to seize the amazing opportunities which appear in our American communities? Where will arise a movement which will inspire even a few communities to seek out, adequately support, and respond to such leadership?

The deepest tragedy lies in the vast fund of good intentions which multitudes of these befuddled ministers are pouring into their futile rounds. They want to make their lives count. They want to "bring in the Kingdom of God." What can cure them of their blindness? Who will blaze a trail which those with eyes to see may follow?

Joseph Ernest McAfee.

Jottings

Asked to explain his extraordinary energy and power of endurance, Mahatma Gandhi offered this recipe for health:

A clean heart, a clear conscience, a cool head, regular communion with God, abstention from carnal food and pleasure, no alcohol, smoking or condiments, a strict vegetable diet and love for my fellowman.

Why does a Quaker President allow the celebration of such a day as Army Day? On this day, New York was occupied by a huge military parade, aroused by roaring aeroplanes flying in military formation, and deluged by loud-speakers bellowing from out the skies the greatness of the army and the glory of arms. All this requires money, much planning, and orders from Washington. Why is it permitted?

O. H. Caldwell, radio engineer, states that, if Einstein's theory of curved space is correct, all radio programs will some day be echoed back to earth. "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

It is interesting to see rotogravure picture of King Alfonso, of Spain, enjoying himself in Paris. If he likes it so much there, why doesn't he stay there, and thus settle the Spanish problem?

When, in his early days of educational reform, President Eliot was told that students were not fit for self-government, he replied that they must learn. "And the way to learn," he continued, "is to try." This is wise counsel, not only for men but for nations. India, for example! And the Philippines!

The Methodist Church houses Bishop Cannon and —Harry F. Ward. The Baptist Church holds Dr. Massee and—Harry Emerson Fosdick. The Episcopal Church includes Bishop Manning and—Howard Mellish. Will somebody please tell us what a denomination is, and why? J. H. H.

A Free American Looks at India

III—Democracy and Caste

In Poona on a hill-top is a temple to the goddess Parvati. She is made of gold and holds on her knee her husband Shiva, who is made of silver. A young Hindu with a Gandhi cap spoke to me on the way up to the temple. Now that is just the joy of being in India, to have people come up and speak to you on the road. It is so human and the caste-business doesn't come in the way at all. I don't believe there was much difference between that man's religion and my own. We might be separated by a few fossils. He tried to get me admitted to the temple, but to no avail. I was not a Hindu. The Brahmin priest would not admit me. This priest had on his forehead three upright painted stripes, branching upwards from the nose. The two outside stripes were painted white, the middle one being red. These stripes, which look like sticks, are the mark of the Brahmin caste. These three-stick people abound in the south of India. There on the top of the hill I seemed to be face to face with the great unyielding wall of Hindu exclusiveness, a wall which reaches from Kashmir to Madras. I don't understand Brahminism or caste. Perhaps I am an inferior person. But to me Brahminism is a nuisance and caste is a nuisance. They are a delusion, a sickness of the human brain. A man is told a million times that he is a Brahmin or that he is an untouchable. It is a lie, but the lie is told to him so many times, that finally he believes it. Caste rigidity is particularly strong in the south. The Brahmin of the north is a patriot. The Brahmin of the south is chiefly interested in maintaining the supremacy of his caste. Of course there are exceptions. Many of them are manly types. But many of them look to me like hemaphrodites.

As I stood on the hill-top, it flashed over me that so long as this petrified mass of Hindu exclusiveness remains unshaken, small is the hope of any mass-movement in India towards democracy. The Indians in fact do not talk about democracy. They have had a great deal of slop handed out to them from the west under the name of democracy. But still there is such a thing as democracy.* What is a revolution made out of? A mere explosion of force does not constitute a revolution. Neither can a revolution be accomplished by millions of people lying on the ground and letting policemen club the life out of them. When the French wanted to make a revolution they stormed the Bastille. When the Americans wanted to make a revolution they organized "Minute Men" and laid up muskets and powder. Those revolutions were made out of something. The powder that made them go was the powder of social equality. Back of them and underneath them were the words of Jefferson: "All men are created equal." Back of these words was something else, far, far back.

Force or no force, war or no war, no revolution can be achieved today which is not based on the same dynamic principle. To the principle of equality should be added that of fraternity. Caste is one thing. Fraternity is another thing, and they do not mix. The west has become corrupt and cynical through materialism. India is true and simple and she will understand the truth of these statements and find the power to put them into practice.

England governs India, priding herself on the "impartiality" with which she sits as a judiciary over the squabbles of "inferior races." The greatest British

*Nobody has yet put democracy on a shelf so that it will not, from time to time, tumble down off from the shelf.

virtue has ever been the self-righteousness, the heroic self-denial, the silent uncomplaining suffering with which England has carried the "white man's burden." She has shrewdly invested capital in India but in order to insure profits she has always been au unselfish martyr to giving India "law and order," to crushing out hooliganism and Gandhism.

But today the old superiority-complex of John Bull seems to be getting very weak in its joints. Things seem to be slipping backward and not forward. There is the terrible debt which must be paid to Uncle Sam. There is the navy to be kept in the pink of condition. There is the helpless army of the unemployed, like innocent birdlings, opening their mouths for doles. Can England "catch up" with the onward march of events without cutting down her overload of moral superiority and without submitting some of her choice social and political institutions to treatment of a surgical nature? The feudal system is very picturesque, but also very expensive. There is in England a fine moral disdain for the bolshevik methods of Russia, and admittedly some of those methods are unpleasant.

Both the American and French revolutions were regarded in England as very vulgar affairs. Nevertheless that fact did not discourage Sam Adams, Washington, Mirabeau and Danton. Could those revolutions have been handled in a different, more Christian, less vulgar method from the raw way in which they were handled? When we ask ourselves, could their results have been obtained by submission to blows just as well as by the policy of giving a few blows, we must take into consideration that those revolutions were the working out of principles which were deeply imbedded in the mentality of the American and French peoples. They were acts of religious conviction. There was no cheap hypocrisy about them whatever. A river will find its way to the sea by one channel or by another channel. Violence and war were against the Christian religion, but the historic church had so far sold out its soul to the English and French monarchies that such champions of the masses as Jefferson and Rousseau found themselves driven to the brink of atheism. But the humbuging of the priests and bishops could not alter the religious mentality of the masses who understood very well the plain meaning of the Gospels, as fundamental charters of liberty. On the one hand the religion of those peoples condemned bloodshed and warfare, but on the other hand it insisted on liberty, equality and fraternity. The Civil War in the United States was an event of the same order—a war for a principle.

Here we are contrasting the Hindu mentality with the Christian mentality, without any desire to disparage the one or the other. These peoples are really just of the same nature! Both have been made and developed by the same cosmic law. The economic or political slave who fights his way out of slavery will make a religion out of the whole affair and he will hand that religion down to his descendants. He in turn had some kind of religion, some kernel of truth, handed down to him from his ancestors, and it is with the help of that religion, feeble and mythical as it may be, that he will take his bearings. To it he will link up his own work, add to it whatever soul-force he has. That is what Gandhi is doing today. He is trying to reach his people through their own language and through the books which they understand. Every man who fights for an idea must fight with the weapon which he can use the best. That may be called "pragmatism," but after all there is some truth in pragmatism. Not many people have ever read Plato. He is high above the level of the masses. But Plato has been handed down over tens of centuries simply because the world cannot get on without philosophy. Plato had a conception of a Republic and that has lived. The conception of a Republic will go on living for many thousands of years to come. Tyranny, injustice, the enslavement of labor by capital, the enslavement of one race by another, are all things which involve bloodshed and violence. When such men as Garibaldi, Danton, Cromwell, Washington, Lincoln resorted to warfare to do away with bloody systems, history has not written them down as unmitigated monsters. Their way might not have been the best way, but it was better than no way at all. The world had to move forward and they helped it to move forward. That too is the lesson of the Gita.

Today we are looking to India. Can India take up the work of these men whose lustrous names have been mentioned? Can India carry forward the sacred torch? Will India really qualify herself for carrying forward the sacred torch? Will she strip herself naked and challenge the tyrant to do battle with her? For many years missionaries have been trying to convert India to Christianity. The best way to arrive at the desired result is not to try to convert anybody into anything. The best way is to stand back of India and help her arm to hold aloft the sacred torch of liberty, equality, fraternity, for that will give the angels joy in heaven. It will bring peace, justice and progress to the earth.

EDWARD HOLTON JAMES.

Beyond Compromise

My heart is singing because Gandhi stands
And will not yield an inch to compromise.
Too long have saints played with their shifts and lies
Who are the governors of subject lands,
Or fool their own with "safe and sane" demands
Which are but madder madness in disguise.
In vain we wait for trucklers to devise
What loyalty to Heaven's high will demands.
"The hour has come" when every "Son of Man"
Must dare whatever cross the world assigns
To him who makes humanity his own.
That righeousness is righteousness alone
That love's resistless militance divines,
And breaks a lance with every sordid ban.

ROBERT WHITAKER

Credo

To live so pure that every day shall see
Some grace unfolded in the soul of me;
To make my mental home a sacred shrine,
A crucible in which thought grows sublime;
To keep my heart a golden, radiant sun,
A vital spark, where love sees all in one;
To have my body clean, a temple pure,
The symbols vibrant, holy, strong and sure;
To open up more channels of God's Power;
To feel His grace my great creative dower;
To have it flow through me to all mankind
This is my creed, my hope of heaven defined.

MARGA CALLICOTTE.

Broaden, Europe, or Die!

Gaston Riou's leading article in the first number of the *Nouvelle Revue Mondiale* propounds one of the most serious problems confronting European liberals today. I feel I must reply to him without delay, even though I am still ill from an exhausting sickness. Bear with me if my pen should respond poorly to my thoughts.

I thank Gaston Riou for the friendly courtesy with which he mentions me. But he is entirely mistaken as to my true character and the stand I am taking. No one has the right to label me a sentimentalist who is shutting his eyes to reality in order to dream of the Promised Land merely because I have tried, in the course of my literary career, to rouse the mysterious force of dreams, the deep and primitive springs of the mystic, the musical and subconscious force dormant at the heart of the Occident. I am a historian by nature as well as profession, hence clear-seeing, inured to seeing the chronic villainies and strayings of mankind; I am a free Frenchman, a Gaul, and not hoodwinked by the political lies and the holy principles in which the states of all times and countries clothe their unholy egoism. Certain of my books have, by their possibly disproportionate success, laid on me a moral responsibility toward a public which expects me to spoon-feed it, and my sense of responsibility has too often forced me to measure out to it as much of the truth as it could swallow. But I shall not spoon out truth here, in writing for my intellectual peers, who are, or should be, the leaders of Western Democratic thinking on the eve of great conflicts.

When I refuse to identify myself with Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and M. Briand's Pan-Europe, to which Gaston Riou has just brought the warm enthusiasm of his generous nature, I do so not in the name of a Utopia, a City of God, which may exist in two thousand years, or may never be. This discussion concerns the very ground on which we now stand, the threatened region where we have gathered during the vigil before the fray. It concerns the assaults we shall undergo tomorrow. The idealistic intellectuals of the Franco-European League are not sufficiently alive to this. Let me remind them! If my words seem harsh and bitter I crave their pardon. I was as blindly deceived as they until the last months of 1914, and it is because I later discovered the abominable fraud that I feel I have the right to open their eyes.

Since the big European states and America, the banner-bearers of white civilization, have replaced absolute monarchy with idealistic democracy, the brutal and crafty political power which governs the world has felt the need of pretending to the people a submission to their will, which it does not consult, and to the thought-systems of their intellectual elite, which it abuses. To be exact, the masters, even in the era of absolute power, always had recourse to lies about lofty motives, religion, country, and the like, to cover their personal passions. But today the contrast is even more glaring between the shameless cynicism of the moneyed powers who actually run the state, and the democratic fiction with its sublime phantoms of right, justice, and liberty, which they employ as their slogan and screen.

Among us, comrades, no man is still duped unless he wants to be. We know very well that the people in our democracies govern nothing, and know nothing about government. For their one source of information is the press, and that is almost entirely sold out to the money powers. Hence the force of the people's critical reactions is reduced to zero. No one has taught the people to control and question the logic and the facts, or rather the blind and contradictory passions with which they are inoculated to suit the need of the masters of politics. This is a difficult course of education which the state forbids rather than encourages its teachers to give the people, since the first aim of such knowledge would be to open the people's eyes to the tricks of statecraft. And, alas, the intellectual liberals, who should instruct them as elder brothers, cannot do so, for their social education is hardly more advanced than that of the people. They are preeminently the pawns of state trickery.

When divided Europe was battling, both camps needed noble voices to sing anthems to country and celebrate the heroism of immolation in order to shelter their ignoble secret covenants, their divisions of the world (land and business), their spoliations and their crimes. They had no trouble finding them. I know with what sincerity and self-abnegation the best intellectuals of our unhappy Occident accomplished their mission, and at the cost of what sacrifice of self and family. And among the university men, my comrades of yesterday—how profound the mourning for the victims that were offered to the Moloch they were made to invoke. But I also know, I *know* how they were duped and how many dupes they made, and they have never forgiven me for telling them so.

What else could they have done? Back in those days while I was slowly and painfully freeing myself of all the illusions which had bound my youth (official historic lies, lies in the national and racial conventions, lies of tradition and state) I began faintly and tremblingly to hear the liberating response the people should have made, and I dared not utter it. I shall speak out today. It is the answer Lenin made in 1917; let the armies of Europe *revolt* against the war lords and fraternize on the field of battle.

But let us not revert to that part. That is a long confession which I owe it to myself to write if I still have time, for it might start the travail of thousands of souls which harbor these thoughts but dare not bring them to light. Let us stop talking of yesterday. The present suffices us. Let us talk of the great and redoubtable today!

The generous intellectuals of present-day France, of whom Gaston Riou has constituted himself leader, are intoning the new anthem "Europe, my country"—and they have no idea that they are serving the latest interests of the astute masters of the day.

There seem to be two conflicting trends in French politics today. There is the iron-handed group which means to keep by violence the oppressions imposed on Europe by violence, and there is the velvet-gloved school which attempts to gain assured peace with all Europe by allowing the victors a magnanimity involving no risks or costs. There is a difference in political intelligence between the two, but not in nationalism. Both camps adhere to the credo of victory and the untouchability of its decrees.

What does the "realist school" of French politics want? To keep the fruits of victory unthreatened by the destruction of a new war. Hence, to establish peace

and the laws of a Franco-Europe on the basis of the 1919 treaties. But they are very careful not to inquire if these treaties are just or unjust, if they are not abominable abuses committed by violence triumphant, if they do not rise on a scaffolding of intolerable crimes and iniquities which still continue. The fact is that the boundaries established by the treaties of 1919 cannot, from the point of view of two-thirds of Europe, be maintained. Our French informants stop their ears to the agonized cries of the vanquished countries: Germany, rubbed raw, whose enormous energy is being reborn—Germany is starved and will not be able to bear this repression more than a year or two without social and national convulsions that will make the Western world tremble; peoples and parties are being persecuted and tortured by France's allies, as in, for instance, Pilsudski's Poland; Hungary, reduced to despair, is ready even for crime if that will snatch its heroic race from the tomb. It is clear that such a Europe is an insult to Europe, a criminal mockery, and the first gang leader à la Mussolini who cares to ruin French supremacy will have an easy time rallying all those desperate men about him.

If these "Europeans" like Riou have the sense of "reality" that they like to say they have, let them prove it by ceasing to be the dupes and supporters of a purely verbal generosity which offers peace as it squats astride the world and pummels it. Let them be the first to start a revised European peace provided with all the guarantees of political prudence, but sincere, loyal, and a real attempt to wipe out the worst injustices and feuds. Let them be clear-headed and big enough to look for themselves at the mistakes and wrongs their own country has caused in Europe, and then offer to right them. True, such a revision, no matter how moderate, would bring with it fatally great sacrifices on the part of the victors; they would have to share the cost of ruining Europe. Any man who dared preach such a doctrine to France could not hope for popularity. But if he demands peace with his heart as well as his lips he should know how to pay for it in personal sacrifice. I insist on a grand assize of Europe where the people's representatives loyally and unitedly may review the possible conditions of life together. Until these are found and accepted there is no use in repeating "Europe!" There is no Europe. There are peoples bound and gnawing at their chains. There are those who tighten those chains. With whom are you?

That is only the first point. Let us proceed to the second. The almost exclusive preoccupation of western "Europeans" is, quite naturally, the establishment of lasting peace in the West through a Franco-German reconciliation. It is a great aim. I have always worked toward it. But it is only a part of our aim, and, to speak my inmost thought, its realization is not the principal problem now. Today the gravest risk does not lie in a renewal of the Franco-German struggle. I know Germany well enough to believe that only noisy but unimportant minorities think seriously of another war with France. The economic condition of the country makes war impossible. And it is very striking that Ludendorff, the generalissimo of the last war, should flood Germany with his deluded little books, trying to turn it away from a new war in which, as during the Thirty Years' War, it would, as things stand, be the field of battle and ruin for all Europe; and Ludendorff refuses to be the grave-digger in that cemetery! He declares in advance that if war breaks out he will have no part in it. The shrieks of the Hitler group aim at intimidation rather than action. All these party agitations are no more than circus didos today. At present the real game is being played within the business world. A little more than a year ago, in an article on The Piracy of Peace published in *Europe* for November, 1929, I violently denounced the secret negotiations pursued for some years between Arnold Rechberg, the German potassium magnate, and the French nationalist business men—those alarming projects (publicly confirmed by Rechberg) for a Franco-German military alliance which would allow the big German munition manufacturers a new lease on life and give the French captains of industry a share of the profits. Just now it is rumored that these negotiations are more active than ever. The big German industries, which are prevented by the economic crisis from investing sufficiently large sums in armament, are seeking financial aid from France in rehabilitating German war industries and offering France, along with part of the profits, the chance to increase French armament as well.

These monstrous projects of martial partnership are one of the secret pivots of the new Pan-Europe. I should like to know what the French intellectuals of the Franco-European League think of them, and if they have a mind to wreathe them with garlands. I will not allow them to ignore the facts and refuse to consider whither their Franco-Europe would inevitably be dragged by such protectors. The two most powerful Western states will not strengthen their munitions and armies and then leave their swords sheathed. Their maws are ravenous for prey, and, unable to rend it singly, they are agreeing to divide it. Where is this prey? Gaston Riou, who sweetly compares me to Mary in the Gospels, to Mary, the mystic adorer of the Master, who, seated at his feet, dreamed with her eyes closed. He assigns himself the role of worthy Martha, who cooked for the Master. Has Gaston Riou lifted his eyes to his Master's face? Can he tell me who this Master is? Who will he be tomorrow? Will he be the Comite des Forges, the Standard Oil, or Sir Henry Deterding? I imagine our good Martha will upset the *pot-au-feu* with a frightened start when she sees who has taken the place of the Master she loved and dreamed of. As for me, I have never aspired to play Mary. I claim my Gallic heritage from Diderot rather than Rousseau; I am a man without a master, and I delegate my housekeeping to no one. My grandfather, Colas Breugnon, taught me as a child to be wisely afraid of Nivernais sheep (they're chamois—it takes but three to strangle a wolf!).

Poor sheep! "If the wolf were all, we'd know how to guard against him. But who will protect us against the shepherd?"

I have never been more than half-asleep, and I have been watching the antics of the bad shepherds for years as they tried to blockade the U. S. S. R., their scoundrelly collusion with the White émigrés and the reactionary factions, our military missions sent to organize the mercenary armies of Poland or the Balkans. The recent Moscow trial told me nothing I had not suspected, allowing for the supplementary exaggerations with which rogues like Ramsin adorned their confessions to save their necks. The fundamental facts of these confessions are only too easily verified. The U. S. S. R. is the prey they aim at. If

the plans against Russia have failed so far, it is only because, luckily for it, the big international robbers, the Anglo-Franco-German captains of rapine, have fought clumsily over possession of the bearskin without coming to an agreement. Once the agreement is made and the European business and army bloc is organized, does any one dream it will lie inactive faced by a Soviet world which is its social negation and whose success would menace its own existence?

So I ask Gaston Riou, what position will he and his friends take? Which camp? Will he continue to serve the Master of oil and petrol, the Western business bloc, ideologically? Or what will he do? Cards on the table! Here are mine! If the U. S. S. R. is menaced, no matter who its enemies may be, I am on its side. I am not blind to what seem to me to be its mistakes. I have often told Russia directly. But I believe and I know that it incarnates the most heroic adventure, the most solid social hope of the future. If it disappeared I should no longer be interested in Europe's future. I should consider it sociologically damned for centuries to come.

But that is not all. Another conflagration is flaming outside our doors. To charm her young lovers, the fair Europe, whose knight errant is Gaston Riou, has borrowed the form of a pretty girl of 1789—the Goddess of Reason with her blossoming breasts bearing the new evangel of the Rights of Man. But she has less pretty features under the make-up. The rest of the world knows her tiger snout. The democracies of today are empires (some would say vampires). These beasts of prey have divided the carcass of the earth. Their appetite is immense. They gorge themselves with the gold and blood of peoples twenty times more numerous than they. The British lion has his claws sunk into the flanks of India, sunk so deep he cannot withdraw them, nor live detached from his prey. We French, who let him take this magnificent game in the days of the unfortunate Lally and Louis the Beloved, made up for it rather well later on. It is noteworthy that our imperialistic expansion coincided with the establishment of the Third Republic. "In a republic," Victor Hugo might have said "there are publicans." The climax of the Roman republic was the reign of Crassus and Verres. Naturally we made away with a fourth of the planet only in order to bring it the light of our civilization, our culture, and our language, which are the most beautiful and perfect of all. But our lucky charges have the ill grace to prefer their own. Ingratitude we know is the law of life. And the great Asiatic races accept no blame for attempting a renaissance of their own. The foremost, Japan, has declared itself adult by force of arms. China, awake now, will never go back to sleep. And, conscious of its power, Gandhi's India has just given the signal for the great emancipation. The rest of Asia will not take long to follow. Our Indo-Chinese empire has already manifested the first awakening twitches, which the proconsuls of our democracy have, naturally, wiped out in blood. The same wakening thrill is coursing through the large body of Islam, which from end to end covers about a third of the old continent.

The question will arise tomorrow, it has arisen today: Where are Gaston Riou and his friends going to stand—with the Great Cod Rubber (automotive) flanked by all his pantheon and his holy harem—the Goddess of Liberty, Spiritual Enlightenment, Art, Science, Progress, Civilization? Or with the great brothers, Asia and Africa, trying to snap their chains? I will have no sidestepping. When the duel starts—and the blind selfishness of Europe makes it almost inevitable—what soldiers will docilely help the adventurers of Europe combat a world fighting for independence?

I answer for myself, pledging no one else, but pledging all of myself: I will not be such a soldier. Europe, if you enter upon this monstrous war I will march against you, against your despotism and your rapacity, and for my brothers in India, China, Indo-China, and all the oppressed and exploited countries. I shall do so not only in the name of justice and the racial rights which you will lyingly invoke, but in the name of civilization itself, of the *greatest* civilization—the unlimited progress of the human spirit. For this spirit has a vital need in this hour to be enriched and renewed by the intellectual and moral contribution of these magnificant races, who, through centuries of rapine have extorted from them their gold, still hold fast to their spiritual treasures, their ancient and now resuscitated civilizations.

I shall hope against all hope that the mighty onset of both hemispheres can still be averted. But if this eventuates I am too near death to hide my thoughts. I say to the U. S. S. R. of Lenin, and I say to the Asia of Sun Yat-sen and Gandhi: Brothers, count on me! I am only one man among millions. But that man is and has all his life been a liberal voice in the West, the voice of the Jean-Christophes and the Colas Breaugnons, a free worker, brother of the free workers of the world, who want to open the way to a universal labor union, free of the yokes and prejudices of race, caste, and class.

And I say to Europe: Broaden, Europe, or die! Wed all the new free forces on earth! You are stifling in your outmoded liberty cap, glorious but crushed down over your face. Tear it off! Breathe and let us breathe! We need a home, a country, more far-flung than Europe.

My country is not yesterday. My country is tomorrow. And the angelus has already rung out this day.

ROMAIN ROLLAND.

Democracy

The gardener's shears may prune and snip,
The hedge grow thick and high;
Yet beauty still is free to roam
While wind and bee may fly.
Hollyhocks top the garden wall,
Larkspur lifts a spire;
And beauty from the mansion's ground
A cottage may acquire.
Flowers obey no rules of caste;
Pride cannot hedge them in;
Scattered seeds, their visiting cards,
Betray where they have been.

BERNICE IRELAND POWELS

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English*]

LXXVII

1.

Every man's task in life is to become better and better. And therefore only those sciences are good that aid in this.

2.

People call science either that most important science in the world, by which man comes to know how he must live in the world; or else all that it flatters a man to know, and that may, or sometimes may not, be of use to him. The first kind of knowledge is a great matter, the second is for the most part an idle occupation.

3.

There is no end to knowledge. And therefore, it cannot be said of one who knows a great deal that he knows more than one who knows very little.

4.

Science and art are only good when they serve the welfare of men. If science and art do not serve the welfare of men they are certainly harmful.

5.

The only explanation of the insane life—a life contrary to the conscience of the best men of all times—that is led by the people of our day, is that the younger generation is taught innumerable most difficult subjects (the nature of the heavenly bodies, the state of the earth millions of years ago, the origin of organisms, and so forth); while they are not taught the one thing that is always necessary for everyone: what is the meaning of human life, how it must be lived, what has been thought about this question, and how the wisest men of all ages and all nations have decided it. Not only do they fail to teach the younger generation all this, but instead, under the name of the law of God, they teach the most evident nonsense, which the teachers themselves do not believe. The whole edifice of our life is built on air-bags instead of stones. How can this edifice fail to tumble down?

6.

Knowledge is only knowledge when it is acquired by the efforts of our own thought, and not by memory alone.

LXXVIII

1.

To become better and better is the whole task of life, and it is only possible to become better through effort.

2.

Everyone knows that you can do nothing without the effort of physical labor. It needs to be understood that likewise in the chief thing of life, in the life of the soul, you can do nothing without effort.

3.

If only all men desired simultaneously to live according to the will of God, all life would be good. But all men do not yet desire this. Hence for the individuals who do desire it, life according to the will of God does not come about of itself—they have to make an effort.

4.

We often hear it argued that all efforts to change our life, to root out evil and to establish the righteous life are useless; that all this will come about of itself, that progress will do everything. People are traveling in a row-boat. The oarsmen arrive at their destination and go ashore; but the travelers remaining in the boat do not take up the oars, because they suppose that since the boat was moving before, it will go on moving now.

5.

Every man of our day, who has acquired even a vague consciousness of Christianity, is in the position of a sleeping man who dreams he must do that, which even in the dream, he knows he should not do. He knows this in the very depths of his consciousness, and yet it seems he cannot change his position, cannot come to a stop, and leave off doing what he knows he should not. And, as happens in dreams, his position becomes more and more painful, and finally reaches the last degree of tension. Then he begins to doubt the reality of what appears before him, and makes conscious effort to break the charm that binds him.

The average man of our Christian world is in just this position. He feels that all he is doing and all that is being done round him, is senseless, monstrous, impossible and contrary to his conscience. He feels that this situation is growing ever more and more painful and is reaching the last degree of tension.

"This cannot be: it cannot be that we, men of our day, with a Christian consciousness of the dignity and equality of men that has entered into our very flesh and blood, with our need of peaceful communication and union with the nations—it cannot be that we are actually living in such a way that every joy and comfort of ours is paid for in the suffering and lives of our brothers; that we are every moment on the verge of falling upon each other like wild beasts—man upon man, and nation upon nation—and of mercilessly destroying the lives and works of others just because a certain fine diplomat or ruler says or writes some stupidity to another fine diplomat or ruler like himself."

This cannot be. And yet every man of our day sees that this very thing is being done, and being done with the assurance that it should be so, and could not be otherwise.

As a man who is dreaming does not believe that what appears to him to be reality is actually reality, and wants to waken to another, *actual* reality; just so the average man of our day cannot, in the depth of his soul, believe that this terrible position in which he finds himself, and which grows ever worse and worse, is reality—he wants to waken to the reality of the consciousness that already lives within him.

As the man who is dreaming needs only to make an effort of consciousness and ask himself, "But isn't this a dream?" to have the situation which seemed so hopeless to him instantly fall into ruins, and to wake to a quiet and joyous reality; just so the man of our day has only to make an effort of spiritual consciousness for this unnatural, impossible situation to pass away, and for his life to be established in accord with the real spiritual activity that is already recognized by the great majority of men at the present time.

LXXIX

1.

To renounce self does not mean to renounce life. On the contrary it means to strengthen our true life, by renouncing the life of the flesh.

2.

To understand how indispensable it is to renounce the life of the flesh for the life of the spirit, we have only to imagine how terrible, how revolting, the life of man would be, were it entirely given over to mere physical, animal desires. The real life of man only begins with the renunciation of animality.

3.

All men live both for the animal self and for the soul. The only difference is that some live more for the soul and less for the body, while others live more for the body and less for the soul.

4.

The real renunciation, necessary to life, is only that by which man renounces animal life for the sake of divine love. But there can be a renunciation of animal life for aims, which, though lower, may still lead him up from gross animality—renunciation for the sake of beloved individuals, for the sake of the family, of the nation, of human glory. However false and harmful to himself and others such incomplete renunciation of animality may be, still it is an approach, though a crude one, to the true life that is possible only through self-renunciation.

5.

As a plant cannot live without light; and, growing in the open, does not ask whether it should grow, whether the light is good, or whether it should not wait for some other, better light—but takes the only light in the world, the sun, and reaches out toward it; so a man who renounces personal happiness does not argue about whom he is to love, whether to love those who he now loves, whether there is not some other, better love than which is possible at the moment—but gives himself up to the love that is now within his reach toward any being with which he comes in contact.

6.

There is no other love than that which gives up its soul for its friend. Love is only love when it is sacrifice of self. Only when a man forgets himself and lives by the life of him whom he loves, is this true love, and only in such love can we find happiness, the reward of love. It is only because there is such love in men that the world stands firm.

7.

In order to understand Christ's teaching of the salvation of life, we must first of all understand what has been said by all the prophets, by Solomon, by Buddha, and by all the sages of the world concerning the personal life of man. It is possible not to think about this (as Pascal puts it—to bear a little screen before us to hide from our sight that abyss of death into which we are all rushing) but once we consider the question of the separate, personal life of man, we become convinced that all this life, if it be merely personal life, is not only meaningless, but is a cruel mockery of the heart and reason of man and of all that is good in him. And, therefore, in order to understand the teaching of Christ, it is necessary first of all that we come to our senses, bethink ourselves, and that there should take place in us the very thing of which John, the precursor of Christ, spoke, in preaching his doctrine to men who were just as confused as we are. He said "First of all repent, that is, bethink yourselves, or you will all perish." In telling of how those Gallileans perished, who were killed by Pilate, he says

Think you that these Gallileans were more sinful than others, that they suffered so? No, I say unto you. But if you repent not, you shall likewise perish. Inevitable death lies before all. You seek in vain to forget it. Were it to come unexpectedly, it would be still more horrible. There is one salvation: renounce the life that dies, and live by that for which there is no death.

8.

There is nothing more important than inner work in solitude with God. This work lies in checking your desire for the welfare of your animal personality, in reminding yourself of the senselessness of the animal, personal life. Only when you are alone with yourself, with God, can you do this. When you are with people it is already too late. You will act well when you are with people, only if you have prepared in advance a capacity for self-renunciation in solitude, alone with God.

(To be continued)

The Tenement

All, from the tenement,
Sad-eyed and thick-tongued, went,
Hungry and cold, they went
Down to pick coal;
Coal from the railroad tracks,
Coal hugged in burlap sacks;
Sacks clutched in hungry hands
Black from the coal.

Weary and wan, they went,
Trudging with bodies bent;
Bent from the burlap sacks,
Bent from the cold.
Bending and picking crumbs,
Crumbs with hands made of thumbs;
Thumbs from anxiety and
Thumbs from the cold.

Slowly the sacks were filled,
Filled while the babes' cries shrilled,
Shrilled to the skies with their
Hunger and cold.
Slowly the trudging troop,
Bent from their steady stoop,
Turned towards the tenement,
Having grown old.

Bleeding from frozen lips,
Bleeding from finger tips;
Finger tips blackened and
Cut to the quick;
Back to the tenement,
Back all the sad ones went,
Back to bear healing heat
Home to their sick.

Back, at a stumbling pace,
Cold, blued upon each face,
Sons of a sad-eyed race,
Thick-tongued, they went.

* * *

Stoves were now thawing out;
Chilled ones were grouped about.
Hungry, but warm, they were
Near to content.

Slowly the fires died;
Softly the children cried;
Cried through the night for there
Was no more coal.
All, from the tenement,
Sad-eyed and thick-tongued, went,
Hungry and cold they went
Down to pick coal.

SEYMOUR G. LINK

Correspondence

The Gandhi-Irwin Truce: Comment

Editor of UNITY:

On a chance that you may not have already noted its significance, I would like to draw your attention to the second paragraph of the agreement between Gandhi and Irwin. I did not recognize its possible meaning till just recently. It reads: "As regards constitutional questions, the scope of future discussions is stated with the assent of His Majesty's Government to be with the object of considering further the scheme for constitutional government of India discussed at the Round Table Conference. Of the scheme there outlined, Federation is an essential part; so also are Indian responsibility and reservations or safeguards in the interests of India for such matters as, for instance, defence, external affairs, the position of minorities, the financial credit of India, and discharge of obligations."

You will notice in the second sentence that the word *Federation* is not defined; and you will realize that in negotiations of this sort that definitions are usually settled by the side which really has the superior power. Federation could mean either with the Indian States as constitutionally governed organizations, or with the Indian Princes who are not responsible to their people and are really controlled by the British "resident" officials. I think we will find the Indian Congress refusing, at the second round table conference, to federate with any but constitutionally governed States. The British have, no doubt, the other interpretation in mind.

Also please notice that phrase, "in the interests of India." If Britain really has the supreme power, it will decide what is and what is not "in the interests of India." But if Gandhi and the Congress really have the supreme power, they will decide what safeguards are and what are not "in the interests of India." The Associated Press on March 11 reported Gandhi as saying, "The Congress will accept no safeguard which is not clearly proved to be in the interest of India, and those which were discussed at the London Conference were certainly not in India's interest." With Gandhi at the second conference, there will be no subservience or undue deference to British interpretations; and in front of all the world we will see, I think, a number of high-sounding white man's professions and practices shown up in their true light. If the interests of India are to be interpreted by Gandhi, this agreement does not appear to be so much of an acceptance of the proposals of the first Round Table Conference. The second conference may break up on this question. Maybe the Indians cannot as yet, without further non-violent resistance, compel Britain to accept the Congress interpretation of these matters; but on the other hand, the Congress has not agreed to accept the British interpretation, either. I believe it will be found before the struggle is over, that India has more power in the matter than Britain has, because India is willing to suffer non-violently more than Britain. As the suffering is non-violent and in front of the whole world, Britain, unless she sooner yields, will be finally compelled to admit that the essential purpose of the present and proposed government of India is to maintain British trade and finance and that Britain is willing to order the killing of many Indians and the imprisonment of tens of thousands in order to try to safeguard British trade and finance. The brutality and ruthlessness of capitalism will be further exposed to the whole world, and this new type of revelation will do more to profoundly modify and perhaps end capitalism than did the War itself. In the War so much was hidden by anger. The longer Britain (representing the white race) delays in yielding, the more completely naked will she be stripped of her professions of public morality.

In this connection it is interesting to read some of the words of Mr. Justice Sankey, the Lord Chancellor, in the recent debate on India in the House of Lords. According to the London *Times* of March 19, he said, among other things: "We never went to India to conquer. We went there to trade....Finance is undoubtedly important; defence is undoubtedly important; law and order are undoubtedly important. I yield to no man in my desire to see them amply and safely secured, but I am anxious for something more than the triumph of our trade; I am jealous for the reputation of our statesmanship. It is by their moral actions, not by their material successes, that Empires are judges at the bar of public opinion, and by the verdict of history. It is the spiritual things which exalt a nation, and by them we shall be remembered when our triumphs are forgotten."

I write this not in a Pharisaic mood. The United States, in its way, is doing the same sort of things at home and abroad. It happens that in India the issues are more clearly defined, more stripped of the white man's moralistic camouflage, more dramatic than elsewhere in the world. Gandhi's method has compelled us to see more clearly and vividly the real meaning of our actions, of our political and economic institutions. All members of the white race have a legitimate interest in the Indian struggle, for our future relations with the Asiatic and African peoples will be profoundly affected by the methods used by the respective two principal parties in the struggle, even more perhaps than by the immediate results of it. If India wins this struggle by non-violent resistance, the whole world will be morally cleaner and happier.

One other thing is to be borne in mind in regard to the possibility of future association between India and Britain to which both Gandhi and Vallabhbhai Patel have recently referred. Exceedingly few British men and women will care to stay in India if they have to be on terms of complete equality with Indians. Under such conditions, unless there comes a far greater change of heart than seems probable, racial, political and social pride would take Britishers out of India rather rapidly. Hence, if India gets real control of her finance, army, foreign relations, civil service and trade,—it will be real independence, even though it may be called Dominion Status.

RICHARD B. GREGG

Boston, Mass.

The Present Situation in India

Editor of UNITY:

Now is the time for all American friends of India to reassert their loyalty to Mahatma Gandhi. Nobody who knows the history of Indian nationalism will dare overlook the contributions of Gandhi's predecessors or his contemporaries, but for whose combined efforts, not so well known in this country, Gandhi could not have accomplished what he has. But today Indian nationalism is synonymous with Gandhi and the unexpected progress that the Indian cause has made since 1922 climaxing with the negotiations sought by England's viceroy is due to Gandhi's leadership. Because of the true Asian idealism that he exemplifies, Gandhi has brought under his guidance almost every Indian leader. Each of these leaders has a patriotism that equals Gandhi's and an ability that often surpasses his. But for once they were statesmen enough to see, that in India emancipation from British rule had to be sought in a unanimity. Gandhi who reminds every Indian of the highest ideals of his religion fittingly stood as the symbol of this unity.

Any further progress in India can be obtained only by allowing Gandhi complete leadership in the present situation. While England will stand by her good faith, she will never be averse to the use of strategy. England established herself in India because there was dissension, England has continued to be in India because of it, and if dissension sets in once more, England will drive its wedge in so thoroughly, that it will be long before India dislodges it.

There are bound to be discordant notes in any political situation, anywhere, but the magnifying of these into *news*, shows which way the wind blows. In their emotionalism the Indians are apt to ignore these signs, unaware that their opponent keeps an untiring watch. American friends of India must at this moment individually and unitedly exhort the Indians to remain loyal to Gandhi and must themselves reassure him of their continued friendship. For, if Gandhi relinquishes his control there will be certain chaos, which in its turn means economic chaos in more countries than we are now ready to believe.

J. VIJAYA-TUNGA

New York, N. Y.

Masters' "Lincoln"

Editor of UNITY:

I am glad to read Mr. Mead's severe and discriminating review of Mr. Masters' recent book on Lincoln. It's a case of hurting Mr. Masters more than it hurts Lincoln. Let us hope it will have few readers.

BERTHA JOHNSTON

Brooklyn N. Y.

(*Continued from page* 114)

from a scientific angle, as we do other problems. We cannot avoid the primitive human instinct which demands vengeance for the satisfaction of the resentment of the individual. In tribal days our ancestors viewed the punishment of crime as a personal matter to be settled between the parties, or in case of homicide, between the accused and the relatives of the deceased. Sometimes the relatives demanded a life for a life; sometimes blood money was accepted in satisfaction of the crime. Later, under monarchial systems, the commission of crime was considered a personal affront to the sovereign and the punishment was meted out by the ruler to satisfy his demand for personal vengeance. Among the Jews and other eastern people with highly developed religious instincts the crime was a personal affront to the Diety, who demanded satisfaction of his desire for personal vengeance, and the tribe or community killed or cast out the offender to avoid having the wrath of their Diety visited upon them. Until comparatively recent years many crimes that are now minor offenses were punishable by death. Long and bitter experience taught that severe punishment did not deter crime, but made conviction more difficult. Gradually, from this experience, civilized nations have adopted the theory that the criminal laws must be administered solely for the protection of society, and that the lust for personal vengeance must be disregarded in the interest of social order. We have also learned that society itself is in many cases responsible for permitting the subnormal and mentally deficient to be at large when they are clearly subjects for institutional care.

The possibility of the infliction of the death penalty in any case dramatizes it before the public. What should be a solemn deliberation becomes a public spectacle, with a resultant brutalizing effect upon society. It is not desirable to have our communities divided, with one faction demanding the life of a criminal and another faction going to the other extreme of sympathy for the accused, thus greatly increasing the possibility of error, and there is no remedy in case of error.

Trained, intelligent, and conscientious men have made a life study of crime in the past two centuries. The result of their study and experience has been the gradual abolition of capital punishment and the equally gradual decrease in crime. It is true that in our large cities of this country we are plagued by crime of a character before unknown, but even a casual student of the history of our cities will be convinced that crimes by violence are less in number than fifty years ago. There is certainly no crisis in Kansas which necessitates a retrogression toward the dark ages in our criminal laws.

It has been suggested that society has the right to kill in self defense, like any individual. This is true, but the ancient common law rule permitting him who was attacked to kill in self defense was, so my lawyer friends tell me, limited by the provision that the person attacked must "retreat to the wall." In other words, even killing in self defense can be justified only if we in Kansas have our backs to the wall and this legislation is the last resort which will save us from chaos. I perceive no such condition in Kansas. We are a peaceful and law-abiding people, and our record of homicides compares more than favorably with that of neighboring states which have capital punishment.

The need of reform in the administration of the criminal laws is apparent, but this is a short cut, a panacea which seeks to be substituted for the intelligent study and courageous solution of the problem. It is axiomatic that it is not the severity but the certainty of punishment which deters the criminal. If the legislature seeks to improve the present system, I suggest that a non-partisan judiciary and an increase in the qualifications of our prosecutors, such as requiring five or ten years' experience, or employment of able assistant attorneys general in every major case, might be better solutions than the proposed legislation.

In addition to being opposed to the principle of these bills I am convinced that there are serious objections to permitting the jury to fix the penalty instead of the court. This proposal is well defended by its proponents, and the theory may have some merit; however, I do not care to participate in the creation of a condition which is so subject to abuse and error. I have the utmost confidence in the theory that twelve men coming from all ranks of life form the best known instrumentality for the determination of questions of fact. Under our system of jurisprudence, however, the rules of evidence and procedure limit the information which the jury may receive. Under the proposed bill a jury may decree death to the accused while still inflamed by the speech of an able prosecutor, and while the revolting details of the crime arouse their instincts of vengeance upon the criminal. The life or death of a man might well depend upon the skill of the prosecutor, the skill of well paid masters of the law defending a rich client, or upon the lack of skill of a briefless lawyer appointed by the court to defend the penniless accused. If we must have capital punishment let the trained judge pass sentence of death upon the criminal after he has investigated the circumstances and the mental capacity of the convicted criminal.

There is another practical argument against House Bill No. 20, which provides capital punishment for robbery with firearms. This bill places a premium upon murder. If, as the proponents of this bill claim, the fear of punishment deters the criminal, a bank robber who takes the banker with him for a few miles to delay pursuit would have a strong incentive to murder the only man who could positively identify him. The punishment would be death in either instance, and escape would be more certain if the witness were killed.

While I have disliked to veto these bills in opposition to the strong sentiment of the legislature, I have not hesitated to do what I believe to be right. I am convinced that the enactment of this legislation would be a definite backward step. Kansans pride themselves upon being modern, progressive, and civilized. While we are not yet so advanced in our Christian civilization that we can deal with our criminals with the spirit and understanding of Him who on the cross forgave his murderers, certainly we should not take this backward step; we should not remove the State of Kansas from the roll of enlightened states which have abolished legalized murder.

In vetoing these bills I am not only voicing my personal convictions, but also what I believe to be the sentiment of a majority of the people of Kansas.

HARRY H. WOODRING, Governor

Second International Congress of the Theosophical Order of Service

Brussels, 31st July and 1st August 1928, Palais des Beaux Arts.

PRELIMINARY PROGRAMME

July 31st, 1928.

1. p. m.—Chief Brother's Meeting.

2 p. m.—Opening of the Congress by Dr. Annie Besant, Pres. of the Order.

2:30 p.m.—Excursion to the woods of Tervueren. Lecture at Tervuren by Geoffry Hodson "Recent researches into the Cause and Cure of Disease."

8:30 p.m.—Public Lecture of Dr. A. Besant.

August 1st, 1928.

9 a.m.—Chief Brothers' Meeting.

10 a.m.—Lecture by Dr. Annie Besant, Pres. of the Order.

11 a.m.—Lecture by Captain Max Wardall, Int. Sec. of the Order.

2:30 p.m.—Lecture on World-Peace by Miss M. B. Sanders.

3 p.m.—What the Order of Service can do for World-Peace in the various countries and in its various activities: England: speaker, Robert Spurrier; U. S. A.: speaker, Robert Logan;

S. America:

The Continent of Europe: speaker, Miss C. W. Dijkgraaf.

India: speaker: Dr. James H. Cousins.

5 p.m.—Closing of the Congress.

The Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.